

ing their contemptuous diatribes lying down. To continue the myth of FDR that Uncle Joe Stalin was not a bad sort of fellow, that the Soviet Union would yield to sweetness and light, and that decent people could coexist in one world from which war was thenceforth forever banned.

Flag Day 1964 is a time to give sober thought not only to where now stands "the line" but more importantly where stand we with our individual responsibility, in relation to "the standard?" Are we striving to bring what is now a weakening line up to our historic standard, or are we even though it be through indifference alone aiding those forces who would pull it back to one no longer representative of our heritage?

Old Glory, stay you there yet awhile. Your people surely will arouse and again advance "the line" to where you were destined always to stand.

J. HOWARD PAYNE.

### Tocks Island Park

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Parks Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee heard testimony earlier this month on behalf of proposed legislation to make Tocks Island a national recreational area. On June 6, I wrote to Representative THOMAS MORRIS, Democrat, of New Mexico, subcommittee chairman, urging the passage of this legislation.

New Jersey is the most urbanized State in the Nation and most strongly feels the need for additional recreational projects. Conversion of this land and water into a national playground would put over 20 million people within an hour and a half away from boating and camping sites which are all too rare in this most industrialized strip of the country. I also pointed out that northwestern New Jersey would receive multiple economic benefits from the proposed project and new water resources from the planned dam at Tock's Island.

The Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., of June 18, clearly explains the project and New Jersey's urgent need for it.

The article follows:

#### TOCKS ISLAND PARK SUPPORTED

In testifying strongly in favor of legislation creating a national recreation area at Tocks Island on the Delaware, the metropolitan regional council not only gave a strong boost to this move for a large-scale Federal recreation area, but it also emphasized the value of its own accomplishments.

The Metropolitan Regional Council spokesman before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which held a hearing on the Tocks Island National Recreational Area, recalled that Metropolitan Regional Council had acted jointly with the Regional Plan Association in preparing the comprehensive report, "The Race for Open Space," of 1960. This report said, "The Federal Government has a splendid opportunity to preserve this area of natural grandeur at Tocks Island which is within easy reach of the most pop-

ulated part of the United States. The many benefits which will be derived from the Delaware Valley proposal, of which recreation is one, serve a true national purpose."

The Tocks Island Dam, upstream from Delaware Water Gap, will create a 37-mile lake in the Delaware. It has vast water supply, flood control, and recreational potentialities. There is before Congress legislation which would create a recreation area under Federal control along this lake and below the dam. The State has the great Stokes Forest and High Point Park in the area. It also has 6,100 acres of virgin land in the Worthington Tract nearby. The State has offered to negotiate with the National Park Service for the use of any or all of this vast land holding in the development of the Tocks Island recreation project.

As envisioned, the Tocks Island recreation project would include a sizable acreage along the new lake on the Pennsylvania side of the river, a recreation area that would be about half the size of the recreation area in New Jersey.

Federal establishment of this area seems entirely proper even though the land lies in only two States. It is envisioned that the Tocks Island project would serve New York and nearby States intensively and that people would come to it from all over the Nation. The Delaware River Basin Commission estimates that the Tocks Island Recreation Area would record 7 million visitor-days annually.

If the Congress decides to enact the Tocks Island recreation legislation, New Jersey will complement its famed seashore recreation assets with a unique lake and mountain attraction.

### Taras Shevchenko

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1964

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has been attempting by various means to penetrate the Iron Curtain in order that we may, on a people-to-people basis, break down the wall or separation that has kept men of good will from resolving the issues obstructing world peace.

In so many instances we have appealed for understanding on the basis of government to government, and in nearly every case our efforts have been futile for the simple reason that Communist leaders will not bargain honestly or give any assurance that agreements entered into will not be abrogated as soon as it suits their convenience to do so.

That there is an intense grasping for freedom on the part of subjugated peoples is apparent to everyone, and all they ask of us is that we shall reassure them in regard to our sympathy for their cause. The erection here in the Nation's Capital of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko, one of the Ukraine's greatest, is a forward step that these beleaguered people will understand since we thereby honor a patriot who throughout his life symbolized militant opposition to oppressive government.

We hail Patriot Shevchenko as the personification of all that liberty stands for and we shall continue to accept the statute of this great freedom fighter as

added injunction to work for the liberation of all men who writhe beneath the tyrant's heel. May the spirit that flows from his service and sacrifice continue to inspire patriots in every land to the end of time.

### "She Is Thoroughly Committed to Her Career; and She Thrives on It"—A New York Herald Tribune Profile of Representative Edna F. Kelly

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1964

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune yesterday carried an interesting and informative article by Gwen Gibson about the dean of the Democratic Congresswomen, the first Democratic Congresswoman to be elected from New York City, and a Member who has, through hard work and a brilliant mind, become one of our most outstanding experts in this House on foreign policy issues.

Congresswoman EDNA FLANNERY KELLY, as this article points out, is a formidable political foe for anyone who challenges her political leadership in New York. And she is also formidable in House debate, or in getting to the heart of the issues in committee hearings. But I think most of us here think of her not in terms of her so-called formidableness as of her graciousness and charm and gentility—and tremendous ability. She proves again, in her successful career in political life, that it is possible to be feminine and also effective as a legislator, to be close to the problems of the average family and also to be intimately familiar with the world-shaking problems which confront our country and the free world. All of us in the House are proud of her as a Member of Congress, and the women Members are particularly proud that she is one of us.

The late President John F. Kennedy dramatically recognized Mrs. KELLY's great abilities when he appointed her last year as a member of the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. He was not merely extending her an honor of great significance; more importantly, he was sending one of the most capable Members of the House of Representatives into the continuing battle for freedom which is constantly being waged in the U.N., as it is also in many parts of the world. Mrs. KELLY was attacked politically for "absenteeism" from the House because of her presence at these sessions of the U.N.; actually, she was serving her constituents and her country—and this House—in her valiant efforts at the U.N., efforts which brought praise from Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Stevenson, and others who observed her effective manner in which she spoke up for the American

June 23

position in bitterly contested issues before the U.N.

Gwen Gibson gives some of that background in her excellent article in the Herald Tribune in which she has presented a revealing insight into the political career of Congresswoman KELLY—an article I think all the Members who admire Mrs. KELLY will want to read. Under unanimous consent, I therefore submit the article from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune as follows:

FORMIDABLE FOE: Mrs. "Hi, KELLY!"  
(By Gwen Gibson)

Mayor Robert Wagner's fight to unseat the city's Democratic "bosses" suffered a little-noticed but ignominious setback in the recent Democratic primary. The scene of his defeat was Brooklyn, and the cause of it all was one U.S. Representative, EDNA FLANNERY KELLY—a formidable political opponent in anybody's books.

Mrs. KELLY, who was seeking her 8th term in Congress from the most populous congressional district in New York, Brooklyn's 12th, clobbered her tyro opponent, Attorney Eugene Victor, by nearly 3 to 1—19,160 to 6,504.

Neither the Congresswoman nor the mayor acknowledges a feud; this just isn't done in the language of politics. But Mr. Victor was a Democratic-reform-faction candidate with certainly Mayor Wagner's tacit support. And Mrs. KELLY was, and is, a staunch supporter of Stanley Steingut, the Brooklyn County Democratic leader, and the man whom Mr. Wagner would most like to nudge from power. Mrs. KELLY also happens to be coleader of the 18th assembly district with Mr. Steingut; and, incidentally, she deplores the "party boss" expression: "What does it mean? We're all duly elected."

It adds up to a schism, however friendly, between the mayor and Mrs. KELLY, a fact she handles with the polish of a true political pro. "Bob didn't even come into my district during the campaign," she pointed out during an interview. "In fact, about a month ago, I gave a party at the Montauk Club in Brooklyn which marked the first social gathering in 4 years of pro- and anti-Wagner forces." This in itself was a shrewd maneuver since Mrs. KELLY's district contains parts of 12 Brooklyn assembly districts, and approximately half of the latter are—or were—claimed by pro-Wagner forces.

It is not surprising that the mayor ducked a face-to-face contest with Mrs. KELLY, although he openly opposed Representative CHARLES BUCKLEY, the at least temporarily deposed boss of the Bronx. Mrs. KELLY, besides being a Congresswoman, district leader and favorite citizen in her Brooklyn stronghold, is an executive member of the Democratic National Committee and a very popular Member of the House of Representatives, where she is sometimes called the Congressman's Congresswoman.

In the course of a 2-hour lunch-interview in the House Members' dining room, she was interrupted by a steady stream of colleagues. Crusty Representative JOHN ROONEY, Democrat of New York, giving one of his rare compliments, said: "That was a good speech, Edna (on the \$3.5 billion foreign aid bill)." Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER, Republican of New York, who is more courtly, asked: "Has anyone told you today how pretty you look?"

#### AN INSTITUTION

Mrs. KELLY, at 57, the mother of two, and the grandmother of seven, is a striking woman with dark eyes and dark hair, dappled with gray. Tall and trim, she dresses with great style. She has used the same dressmaker (and the same grocer and the same corner drugist) in Brooklyn for 30 years. When Victor chose to oppose her, he tackled an institution.

Half of the voters in her multi-racial district know her by her first name or "Hi, KELLY" basis. She first plunged into politics after the untimely death of her husband, former City Court Justice Edward L. Kelly, in order to build a new life and support her children. She had majored in political science at Hunter College. She was first appointed associate director and then director of research for the New York State Democratic delegation, a post she held until elected to the House in 1949.

In that 1949 race, as in every subsequent congressional race, she beat her Republican opponent by a landslide. She was the first woman Democrat to be elected to Congress from New York City and she remains the city's only woman representative today. Bills of interest to housewives which she has backed include those to give babysitter tax breaks to widows, widowers and divorcees. She is also vehemently opposed to the so-called luxury taxes, levied in 1944, against such things as lipsticks, luggage and handbags. "A handbag is a necessity. Every woman needs one."

Her most important congressional post, which she won in 1955 through seniority and popularity, is as chairman of the high-level House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe. In this capacity she has been embroiled in any number of controversies. The most memorable, to Mrs. KELLY's frank regret, involved her evening at the theater in Cologne last year. Mrs. KELLY and Representative FRANK FRELINGHUYSEN walked out on a U.S.-sponsored production of "Phaedra," denouncing the Greek drama as "erotic." The press was scathingly critical.

On the plus side, businessmen are still applauding her fight to amend the Mutual Security Act to require that areas of labor surplus in the United States be given priority over foreign countries where the purchase of equipment for our foreign aid program is involved. She estimates this has brought more than \$1 billion in new business to the United States.

In Brooklyn, Mrs. KELLY's home is a 3-bedroom middle-income house at 1247 Carroll Street, in the Crown Heights section, to which she moved as a bride: "I've had the same houseman for 30 years." In Washington she and her daughter Maura Patricia Kelly (who contemplates a book about "my mother, the Congresswoman") live in an apartment in Virginia, just across the Potomac from the Capitol Building. Mrs. KELLY's day starts at 8 a.m. and extends indefinitely. She works on a 7-day-a-week basis. With 600,000 constituents, her daily mail load is so heavy she prefers not to estimate the traffic. She is thoroughly committed to her career; and she thrives on it.

#### NO PERSONAL LIFE

"I don't just speak during a campaign," she says. "I go before schools, clubhouses, meetings of all kinds constantly in my district whenever I have the time. I have no personal life. I used to be quite a golfer, but that's no more."

In general, Mrs. KELLY has been a liberal-minded legislator, in support of aid to Israel, civil rights, medical care for the aged and liberalized immigration laws. But she has occasionally perplexed liberals with her staunch opposition to farm subsidies and aid to Yugoslavia, Red China, and Russia. "I think those countries should bear the responsibility for the failure of their own systems."

One of Mr. Victor's charges against Mrs. KELLY during the recent primary was that "her absentee record last year was second in New York only to that of BUCKLEY. Serene in her well-established position in Brooklyn, Mrs. KELLY chose not to answer Mr. Victor's charges, other than on the House floor. In a speech there she pointed out that during a great part of last year's congressional session she was a U.S. delegate to the U.N. "In spite of that fact, I returned to Washington

on every possible occasion to vote on bills important to our district and the Nation," the Congresswoman told her colleagues, who applauded generously.

This is the woman the mayor faces if he would overthrow the bosses of Brooklyn. Victory in a Democratic primary in the 12th District, incidentally, is tantamount to election. But if Mrs. KELLY should beckon before the election in November, chances are Mayor Wagner would hasten to her support.

## Europeans Believe That United States Has Decided To Back Down in Southeast Asia

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1964

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Report of the American Security Council dated June 22, 1964, contains an article by Frank J. Johnson, foreign editor of the Washington Report, with statements very much to the contrary of the pronouncements from both the State Department and the Defense Department and which certainly gives us cause for some concern.

Mr. Johnson's article follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT, JUNE 22, 1964

EUROPEANS BELIEVE THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS DECIDED TO BACK DOWN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Seldom in human history has so much rested upon the decision of a single government. Seldom in the crisis-marked course of the long, weary struggle with our Communist enemies has a decision been as difficult as that which faced the U.S. Government in Asia during the past few weeks. Seldom have the conflicting arguments, pressures, and basic cold war philosophies been arrayed so sharply against each other. And seldom has the result been so tragic for mankind as the course on which the United States now seems embarked in this part of the world.

In Europe, there is little doubt that the United States has now made its basic decision on the future of southeast Asia: We will not extend the war beyond South Vietnam; barring some miracle the war probably cannot be won; this fact is to be accepted; the principal objective of American policy henceforth is to conceal this grim truth as long as possible while searching for a diplomatic, face-saving arrangement that will lift the onus of defeat from the shoulders of the United States; the United Nations may offer such a way out; the purpose of the special conference in Hawaii was not to reach such a decision but to confirm and explain to the people in the field that such a decision had already been reached in Washington.

This is the near unanimous conclusion of the European press in the wake of the latest Laos crisis and the Honolulu Conference on U.S. policy. It is an assessment based upon the same shrewd analysis of the facts which the Communists themselves have undoubtedly been making. It is bound to reinforce the leaders in Peiping and Hanoi in their conviction that the occasionally tough words now emanating from Washington are hollow. This is probably why Peiping has suddenly begun to let it be known that a U.S. attack on North Vietnam will result in massive Chinese intervention. The Chinese are hastening to nail into the coffin of U.S. resolution.

Here are some samples of European press comment:



1. The Swiss newspaper Tribune de Lausanne, June 6, 1964:

**"THE UNITED STATES HAS RENOUNCED EXTENSION OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM"**

"The possibility of engaging in operations against North Vietnam, in order to cut the Vietcong supply lines, has been rejected in view of the risks involved. \* \* \* For the moment it is necessary to continue to fight the Vietcong insurrections. For the moment means, without doubt, until the American elections after which negotiations will be possible—negotiations which the United States wants to conduct, granted, from a position of strength. But one notices, nevertheless, that Washington now seems once and for all to have given up the idea of carrying the war beyond the frontiers of Vietnam."

2. The Paris newspaper Le Monde of June 6, 1964 (commenting on the U.N. Security Council vote on the Cambodian complaint):

"The United Nations vote on Cambodia has less importance than the speech in which Mr. Stevenson exposed in even clearer terms certain intentions of American policy in Indochina. The U.S. representative complained that the Security Council had not adopted the American proposal and had not decided to send the 'blue helmets' to patrol the Cambodian-South Vietnamese frontier. \* \* \* At the same time, Mr. Stevenson noted that the resolution does provide for the sending of a commission of three members to Cambodia and Vietnam to examine the situation on the spot. This can be a beginning, said Stevenson. \* \* \* Mr. Stevenson also declared that the reservations of certain countries toward a U.N. intervention in an area like southeast Asia are understandable, but that the fundamental task of the U.N. is the safeguarding of peace and it must extend itself to all areas of the world."

"In other words, the U.S. U.N. chief has officially admitted that from now on his country will try with ever greater insistence to obtain a U.N. intervention, not only in the relatively minor affair of the Saigon-Cambodian conflict, but in the infinitely more complex civil war in South Vietnam."

3. Le Monde again, June 7, 1964:

"In an election period any problem settled, even badly, is a trump for the administration. In a period of detente and of a search—along the Kennedy lines—for areas of rapprochement with the U.S.S.R., any negotiation which succeeds is useful in itself. \* \* \* The American people have no interest in a faraway war and the current President sees it rather as a source of worry, which would be much better avoided in an election year, than as a front to maintain, cost what it will. From this fact comes the impression that the efforts made by the Honolulu Conference to demonstrate the 'determination' of the Americans lack conviction, and so Washington is looking for a way out through the United Nations. This is merely a camouflaged retreat, and there is no reason for those who believe in it to become indignant at the French proposition for neutralization."

"Neutralization," of course, is the French prescription for an Indochina settlement and it is strongly backed by such influential commentators as Walter Lippmann. Since the United States now seems to be moving in this direction it is well to examine the French-Lippmann thesis.

In essence, the argument maintains that the United States can disengage from the mainland of southeast Asia without the area falling under Chinese Communist control. This hypothesis rests upon the comforting assumptions that (a) China is so preoccupied with Russia that she has no interest in anything more than peace and stability on her southern frontier. Thus, she will be satisfied with a neutralized area in the area and will do nothing to sup-

port subsequent Communist takeovers of the neutralized states of Indochina. This will be especially true if American carriers are still patrolling the coasts (the mechanics of this one are left quite vague); (b) Even if this view is overly optimistic Communist regimes in southeast Asia will certainly be independent and therefore not dangerous because of the historical enmity of these peoples toward China.

Until quite recently Washington did not even begin to buy this argument. Every serious Asian expert understands that it is nonsense on both counts, because (a) the nature of the Sino-Soviet dispute compels China to try and prove her case by extending communism by means of her more aggressive methods, and (b) sheer economic necessity drives China to try and solve her food problem by seizing control of the underpopulated rice surplus areas in southeast Asia. Whatever the nationalist feelings of the Indochinese Communists might be, the sheer power of modern China is irresistible unless the protection of the United States is extended to the non-Communist Asian peoples.

This is why Secretary McNamara made his very realistic speech on the stakes involved last March (see Washington Report 64-15). This is why we were resolved, up to now, to fight in this area. And this is certainly why, up to now, we did not suggest any U.N. intervention. There are an infinite number of reasons why U.N. intervention is not compatible with determined resistance to communism.

The steadily deteriorating military situation in South Vietnam, however, capped by the most recent Communist advance in Laos, forced the United States at last to the ugly alternatives which we had sought desperately to avoid. The Vietnamese, themselves, cannot realistically be expected to fight endlessly if there is no prospect of victory. Either we must attempt to force the Communists to desist from their aggression by punishing their homeland, as the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously recommended in March, or we must accommodate ourselves to the prospect of their ultimate victory. We have already cried "wolf" too many times, to no permanent avail. Plans were indeed prepared for the carrying out of these threats, but it would now seem from a careful reading between the lines of the multitude of vague, ambiguous, and contradictory U.S. statements that the European assessment is certainly correct and that President Johnson is unable to bring himself to an extension of the war. This is the implication of his specific disavowal, at his press conference on June 2, 1964, of any plan to carry the war to the North.

In reaching this decision, President Johnson presumably understands the consequences, but he is in large part imprisoned by the fatal policy of detente and accommodation which now determines our actions toward the Communist nations. A larger war in Asia would fly directly in the face of this policy; it would be repugnant to almost all of our allies and to many of our own people who have been infected by the false notion that Communists generally are changing and may no longer be interested in spreading their doctrine over the world.

Still, politics requires that the situation in Vietnam be held together at least through the November elections. There may still be time for the American people to soberly reflect on the consequences of a U.S. "disengagement" from Vietnam, no matter how the pill is sugar coated, and to register their opinions. This is why it is so important to understand the current direction of American policy.

The situation in Asia must be put into the perspective of the overall trend of world events. On the one hand, Washington has

swung to the philosophical viewpoint that Communist nations as such are not dangerous or worthy of opposition so long as they are semi-independent of Moscow or Peking, or if they do not engage too overtly in the spread of revolution. If Washington itself no longer takes the official position that communism itself is evil and contrary to the basic interests and aspirations of mankind, it is less and less likely that the people of target countries will think so either. There will be no effective counter to Communist propaganda and, as a consequence, Communist rule through parliamentary maneuver and even through the ballot box will become more likely. Communism will become increasingly respectable. This is a major objective of the strategy of peaceful coexistence.

On the other hand, a U.S. military defeat in southeast Asia, resulting in a further geographical loss to communism will make it appear even more inevitable.

What may very well happen, then, is that both of the psychological pillars which have previously served as barriers to Communist expansion; namely: (1) That it was an evil, inherently aggressive force and (2) that it would be successfully resisted by U.S. power, will be swept away. The way will be opened for a tidal wave which could rapidly overwhelm the last barriers of Western civilization, leaving the field of history to a final, infinitely bloody contest between the Soviet and Chinese brands of totalitarian communism for the mastery of the world.

The President has chosen to emphasize peace as our goal in southeast Asia as well as in all the world. Well and good, but peace can never be successfully purchased at the price of liberty. When peace is placed above liberty, liberty is surely lost and in the long run peace as well. When liberty is placed above peace and the Nation so placing it enjoys superiority of strength over the Nation which would deny liberty, then both liberty and peace are preserved.

FRANK J. JOHNSON,  
Foreign Editor.

Clarence S. Lea

SPEECH  
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the sentiments expressed by the Members of the House on the death of Clarence S. Lea, one of our former colleagues.

Clarence, as he was affectionately known, served as a Representative in the Congress from California's First District for 32 years. I had the very great privilege of serving on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Lea during the 78th and 79th Congresses. During the 80th Congress, he was the ranking minority Member and at the end of that Congress he retired after 32 years of service.

Clarence Lea presided over the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the same nonpartisanship which led both parties in his district to give him their endorsement.

He was a great legislator. His personal characteristics eminently qualified him to be a legislator. His patience and

forbearance made possible for him the securing of agreements where other men might have failed.

Clarence Lea devoted a great deal of time to a study of our presidential electoral system. He was convinced that this system would have to be modified by a constitutional amendment and the work which he has done in this field may yet come to fruition someday.

I join the Members in expressing my heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Daisy. I know how close these two were to each other and I hope she will find comfort in her sorrow that the Lord granted the two of them many years of togetherness in happiness and contentment.

### Space

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

of Indiana

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to bring to the attention of the Congress a speech delivered by H. Brainard Fancher at Stetson University in De Land, Fla., on May 14, 1964. Mr. Fancher, is general manager of the Apollo Support Department of General Electric Co., at Daytona Beach, Fla. Mr. Fancher has given us a down-to-earth appraisal of "Space—Its Relationship to Economic Growth":

SPACE—ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ECONOMIC GROWTH, STETSON UNIVERSITY, MAY 14, 1964

(Speech by H. Brainard Fancher)

I trust that you will bear with me when I remind you of the simple economic fact that in order for a nation or a people to progress, a continuous search must be made for new ways to commit the resources at hand to new applications. This basic theorem of economic growth has been the fundamental law which has made some people rich while others with equal resources at their command have remained poor. As students of business, economics, and sociology I would imagine that you became acquainted with this principle early in your studies here.

This principle applies to companies, as well as nations. A company which makes no effort to find new markets or which seeks no new ways to enhance its development soon goes the way of the buggy whip manufacturer. The life of the entrepreneur is a risky one, but from his risks, as I am sure you have been told, springs new industries which bring new products for new markets creating jobs for more people, developing new areas, and all of this represents the economy.

What I have described for you is capitalism, of course, or free enterprise, but call it what you will, you must note that the rationale of progress is not constrained by any single sphere of human endeavor. Economic progress is stimulated by the ambition of nations to be better off than they are, and those that have assumed risks have progressed, and those that merely stayed with the hand that had been dealt them either regressed or perished.

The types of risks that nations have historically assumed can be summarized under

such headings as military, exploration, scientific, and the risk of omission; i.e., where they chose to ignore some suggested opportunity. The motivating factor of assuming these risks—except the risk of omission—has always been the same—either you utilize your strength or you lose it.

These principles must be understood and appreciated if you are to understand the relationship of space to economic growth, for space is where this Nation is looking to stimulate the application of our existing resources toward the needs and conditions imposed by an affluent and dynamic society.

Our space program is made up of a continuum of scientific and engineering work which has been funded and staffed to agree with the fact that the exploration of space is on the books now as a full-fledged national objective.

The current urgent tempo of the space program was set when the Soviet Union placed its first sputnik into orbit, and it became apparent that the Communist world had the potential of utilizing space to the possible detriment of the free world. We were called to our scientific destiny in space with the admonition that "what tyrants can do, free men must do better."

It is uncommon in these days to recall that in fact, our space program antedates Sputnik I by many years, and that we are today very fortunate that it does so.

But sputnik represented a great emotional stimulus, one laced with such ominous phrases as "missile gap," and "Communist control of space." We entered into a phase of space research and development that was termed the "space race" or the "space olympics."

As a footnote to that period of history, and one which is of interest to professional business forecasters, let's reflect back to the claims that were being made in those days concerning the shortage of engineers. Statistics were run out which claimed that today we would be experiencing a terrific shortage of technical people. It was also claimed that even then there was a shortage. Perhaps there was a shortage somewhere, but I have yet to talk to anyone managing a large business which relied on engineering talent who said he had trouble getting enough technical people. I don't believe there was a shortage of engineers. Certain fields such as aerodynamics came close to a shortage, but the well never really ran dry. I think the shortage was a by-product of hysteria caused by temporary Soviet space accomplishments.

I mention this to remind you of the atmosphere in which our accelerated space program was born. The American people are poor losers. They would not tolerate being second rate in space, and in what is now the historical pattern, the industry tooled up and manned up to see to it that our Nation wasn't disappointed.

Meanwhile, back at the laboratories where most engineers work with sciences which in turn deals objectively with realities, some questions were being raised. The main question was, "What is the potential of space?" This was a natural question, since seldom are engineering staffs, in universities, in Government, and in industry, assigned urgently to work or turned loose without first having some reasonable definition of objectives.

Well, the question was asked first by some highly qualified engineers and scientists. And, as could have been predicted, not very much later the people themselves began to ask the question. Many answers have been forthcoming. Unfortunately some of them have not instilled total confidence. Some spokesmen, both public and private, for our national space effort have been inarticulate, with the result that the program were not satisfactorily delineated. If you can imagine any profitmaking industrial

concern committing its resources to such a program as this, you can well imagine the stockholders asking some very searching questions concerning the expected return on the investment.

As time has passed, emotion has given way to careful scrutiny of the entire space program, particularly the moon exploration program, Project Apollo. Time magazine summed it up this way a few months ago, "This winning stuff, this business of getting there first, has lost its edge. The grandstands are emptying and it would seem that the time has come to ask, 'Who did the most sophisticated thing? Not who went to Africa first, but who picked up the diamonds?'"

It is time now for the supporters of our space program—our political, scientific, and industrial leaders—to intellectually, and not just emotionally, justify it.

In many cases heretofore, the advocates of the space program have been very enthusiastic about the practical potential of space—so much so that they may have done space a disservice. Some may have promised more than space can deliver. Before checking the facts they have gone out and claimed that space will do everything from producing better pots and pans to making celestial mining operations practical. Space will defend the Nation. It will improve communications. It will cure diseases.

The surest way to make the public disenchanted with the possible scientific advancements that can be obtained from space would be to promise the moon and end up delivering much less.

As future business managers you must recognize the danger of letting the marketing men write claims for the product before they have been substantiated in the shop. This may be just about the situation we face today with our program for the exploration of space. It shouldn't be. If we progress we could do many wonderful and beneficial things, both for the country and for mankind. But we should not, and cannot, accept specific short-term benefits as objectives and the basis of the program. On the other hand we could bid seven no trump and wind up down, doubled, and redoubled, and vulnerable.

We must not allow the real worth of space to be hidden behind superficial claims for payoffs on a short haul. Short-haul payoffs may be easier to sell, but they are harder to deliver. Let's not be reluctant to accept the fact, and to say, that space exploration is a specification of this Nation's objective to push forward the broad frontiers of scientific knowledge. Let's understand, and make clear to others, that space exploration is a means to an end, and not the end. For as Dr. George E. Mueller, the Director of Apollo, phrased it "In Apollo, for example, we are taking a long stride forward in the creation of the ability to manage a very large research and development effort."

The purpose of an athletic program can be analogous to the purpose of the space programs. An athletic program has as its end objective to improve the health of the participants not to win the most games or races.

The purpose of our space program should not be to see who can throw the biggest engines into the sky, or to get someplace first. Our purpose must be to enlarge the scientific resources and potential of the United States. The key word there is "resource," and we must consider our technical and scientific knowledge as a dynamic national resource to be nurtured and enlarged in its own fruitful employment.

Another, and to my mind, more apt analogy that has often been used in this context has been the exploration and development of the American continents. The initial undertaking, as you all remember from the discovery that whole new land masses existed beyond the shores of Europe and